Approved For Release 2001/00/2017 P59-00882R000300340041-4 26 April 1954

## \*OGC Has Reviewed\*

MEMORARDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director (Administration)

SUBJECT:

Furnishing of Agency Transportation to Perform

Details at Outlying Installations

1. You have requested our opinion regarding the legality of the proposal set forth in the Inspector General's memorandum of 5 April 1954 to the effect that the Agency either furnish transportation for employees temporarily detailed from "L" Building to the D Plant or else reimburse them for any increased transportation costs involved. The memorandum indicates that the nature of the assignment is such that the employees concerned will spend one month out of three at location. In addition we have been advised by RI/FI/DDP that the assignment will permit them to proceed directly to the temporary duty location without first reporting to "L" Building.

25X1A

- 25X1A6a
- 2. While it is well settled that an employee must bear the cost of transportation from his residence to his place of duty (11 Comp. Gen. 417; 19 id 342; and 23 id 836), this rule is not for application to a situation where an employee is detailed to a place of duty other than his official duty station with the result that increased costs on account of travel are incurred. In such a circumstance, not only may the employee be reimbursed for the excess, but, in addition, when authorised to proceed directly to the temporary duty location from his residence, reimbursement in full may be made, without deduction for the cost normally incurred in reporting to the official duty station (32 Comp. Gen. 235). Conversely, when the temporary duty location vis a vis the permanent duty location is such that the travel involves no additional expense, reimbursement in any emount is not proper.
- 3. To the extent that it is considered permissible to use Government funds to reimburse employees as indicated above, we perceive so legal objection to using Government vehicles for that purpose. However, because of the disproportionate expense that such a use would entail, we believe that the determination could be challenged as an abuse of administrative discretion. Further, we note that the use of Government vehicles for special assignments and out-of-town trips is restricted to instances where the use of public transportation is not feasible (R 45-1530 2c).
  - 4. The papers are returned.

25X1A9a

OGC/RJB:afb

Office of General Counsel